UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/544,669	04/06/2000	Haruo Machida	35.C14411	9175

5514 7590 06/24/2004

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER	
BRINICH, STEPHEN M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2624	

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

EXAMINER	
ART UNIT	PAPER
	8

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/544,669	MACHIDA, HARUO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen M Brinich	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-21,24-41,44-60 and 81-83* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-21,24-41,44-60 and 81-83* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *01 April 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 1, 4-6, 13-20, 21, 24-26, 33-40, 41, 44-46, 53-60, & 81-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sklut et al in view of Kuwamoto et al.

Re claim 1 & 81-83, Sklut et al discloses an information processing apparatus which comprises means for obtaining status and connection information (column 20, lines 26-53; Figure 13, status displayed on screen); means for designating the combination of any of icons representing peripheral devices and services on a graphical display (column 18, lines 25-35, Figure 13, ref. no. 304 and 284 has a combination of printer and scanner selected in step ref. no. 198 and 208 of Figure 9, wherein the metaphor elements in Sklut et al refers to graphical icons representing information processing devices according to column 7, lines 58-63); means for determining the validity of combining functions (column 21, line 64 - column 22, line 2 and column 23, line 65 - column 24, line 2, wherein a device in the second selection in the combination is determined for compatibility for use with a device in the first selection; means for displaying a control setup screen for the combined

functions (Figure 13 shows the combination of devices that can be selected by the user in step ref. no. 198 of Figure 9, who thereafter selects the attributes from the device attribute display according to step ref. no. 200, 202 and 204, where device attribute sets can also be modified according to column 15, line 58 - column 16, line 10).

Sklut et al further discloses control means for adjusting the attributes of the peripheral devices (referred to in Sklut et al as metaphor elements) involving said combination of designated icons, each icon equivalent to a metaphor element (column 19, line 60 - column 20, line 10; column 21. line 48 - column 22, line 9; Figure 11, reference no. 246-248), in which said control means control peripheral devices in order to execute the combined functions based on parameter inputs (or attribute settings according to Sklut et al) in said setup screen (Figure 11, ref. no. 252, 256 and 258).

Sklut et al does not disclose expressly a means for displaying the system configuration on a display with icons based on said connection information and status information.

However, Kuwamoto discloses means for obtaining connection information and status information about network peripheral devices (Figure 14, appended with icon 451, 457 etc. are the status display information such as UNUSABLE, (column 13, lines

42-48); and means for displaying the system configuration on a display with icons based on said connection information and status information (Figure 14 ref. no. 470, 451, 456, 457 and 458, column 12 lines 54-59).

Kuwamoto and Sklut et al are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, information processing systems with graphical user interface to control the workflow of peripheral devices in a network.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Kuwamoto and Sklut et al; the display of the system configuration comprising all the network components devices of Kuwamoto replacing the pull down menus of Sklut et al (column 18, lines 19-23).

The motivation for doing so would have been to make the job programming system of Sklut et al user friendlier. By displaying the system configuration on the user interface of Sklut et al, Kuwamoto allows the user to visually capture the available component devices on the screen in a single view. This is an improvement to the user interface program of Sklut et al, as it provides ease of use when selecting devices for input/output functions.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sklut et al with Kuwamoto to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Re claim 4, Sklut et al discloses a scanner icon (Figure 12, reference no. 282) and a printer icon (Figure 12, ref. no. 284), designated in a metaphor combination, with image data inputted to said scanner and corresponding image data to be output on said printer (Figure 12 ref. no. 280, 282, 284 and 300, column 9, lines 29-47).

Re claims 5-6, Sklut et al discloses a system display means that modifies the appearance of designated icons for valid functions with a screen display in Figure 12 that shows an exemplary metaphorical workflow representation. Under ref. no. 282 and 284, the dotted line box encompassing "scanner 1" and "North Printer" shows the designated device by the user.

Re claims 13-16, Sklut et al discloses means for obtaining (or downloading described in Sklut et al) information of said peripheral device designated by the user (Figure 7 ref no. 146-152, column 14, lines 32-42); a system of plural data processing apparatuses capable of performing data communication with each other, each connected to a predetermined communication medium (Figure 7 ref no. 146 and notice several references of no. 112 in Figure 6 describing an application server in Sklut et al),

wherein any of data processing apparatus is assigned as a management server from which status and connection information is obtained (Figure 7 ref. no. 146-166, Figure 11 ref. no. 246-252, column 20, lines 3-28).

Re claims 17-20, Sklut et al's data processing system of peripheral devices includes a printer (column 13, line 39), a facsimile (column 13, line 40), a scanner and a digital copier (column 13, line 36).

Re claims 21, 24-26, & 33-40, the data processing apparatus of Sklut et al includes a means for performing the steps of method claims 21-26, 33-40 (column 24, line 59 - column 26, line 21).

Re claims 41, 44-46, & 53-60, as described above, the system of Sklut et al comprises a computer readable memory medium in which the application is stored (Figure 5 ref. no. 44). Sklut et al's information processing system comprises of a network service module that includes a computer readable memory medium such as a Motorola Power PC processor or controller (Figure 5 ref. no. 44) and a host memory (ref. no. 74).

3. Claims 8-9, 11-12, 28-29, 31-32, 48-49, & 51-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sklut et al in view of Kuwamoto as applied to claims 1, 21, & 41 above, and further in view of Sugiyama et al.

Sklut et al and Kuwamoto are relied upon for the teachings as discussed above relative to claim 1. However, neither Sklut et al nor Kuwamoto discloses parameter determination means for determining a parameter involving said combined functions; setup screen display means to display setup functions based on parameter settings, determination means that determines a choice of copy modes between color or monochrome and paper size.

Re claims 8-9, Sugiyama discloses an information control apparatus that has parameter determination means for determining a parameter involving selected functions (Figure 90 ref. no. BT4, column 75, lines 30-41 wherein the designating window in Figure 90 allows the user to select the type of device or function and the parameter setting window of Figure 91 allows the user to set the parameters of the selected device or function).

Re claims 11-12, Sugiyama's apparatus possesses determination means to determine a choice of two copy modes, color or monochrome (Figure 91 ref. no. BT 4) and paper size (Figure 91 ref. no. BT5, column 75, lines 42-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of graphical user interface control programs at the time of invention to incorporate the parameter setting capability which includes options for setting paper size and copy mode, of

Sugiyama's information processing control system with that of Sklut et al. Both relate to the same functions of handling input and output jobs comprising scanning and printing devices and Sugiyama's control settings can be seen as an extension of Sklut et al's apparatus.

Re claims 28-29 & 31-32, the data processing apparatus of Sklut et al includes a means for performing the steps of method claims 28-29 and 31-32 (column 24, line 59 - column 26, line 21). The limitations of method claims 28-29 and 31-32 are covered wholly by the limitations of the apparatus claims 8-9 and 11-12.

Re claims 48-49 and 51-52, the system of Sklut et al comprises a computer readable memory medium in which the application is stored (Figure 5 ref. no. 44). The limitations of the apparatus claims 28-29 and 31-32 wholly covers the limitations of the computer readable memory medium claims wherein the computer memory stores a computer program which executes the steps of method claims 28-29 and 31-32.

4. Claims 10, 30, & 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sklut et al in view of Kuwamoto as applied to claims 1, 8, 21, 28, 41, & 48 above, and further in view of Unishi et al.

Re claim 10, Sklut et al and Kuwamoto are relied upon for the teachings as discussed above relative to claim 1 and 8. However, neither Sklut et al nor Kuwamoto discloses determination means to determine the resolution of a copy function based on the resolution of said scanner and resolution of said printer as required by claim 10. Unishi discloses the resolution of the copy output function of a scanner and printer combination function based on the resolution of the scanner and printer (column 7, line 50 - column 8, line 6). The incorporation of the determination means of Unishi to determine resolution of the copy function to the scanner input and printer output combination made obvious by Sklut et al and Kuwamoto would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art of printing resolution at the time of invention by applicant as resolution of the input data from the scanner cannot be higher than the maximum allowable output resolution of the printer as this would constitute a conflict in the output printing operation when the input data from the scanner is sent to the printer.

Re claim 30, the data processing apparatus of Sklut et al includes a means for performing the steps of method claim 10 (column 24, line 59 - column 26, line 21). The limitations of

method claim 30 are covered wholly by the limitations of the apparatus claims 10.

Re claim 50, the system of Sklut et al comprises a computer readable memory medium in which the application is stored (Figure 5 ref. no. 44). The limitations of the apparatus claims 30 wholly covers the limitations of the computer readable memory medium claims wherein the computer memory stores a computer program which executes the steps of method claims 30.

5. Claims 7, 27, & 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sklut et al in view of Kuwamoto as applied to claims 1, 21, 41 above, and further in view of Komiyama.

Re claim 7, Sklut et al and Kuwamoto are relied upon for the teachings as discussed above relative to claims 1, 21, 41 and 61. However, neither Sklut et al nor Kuwamoto discloses a system display that displays an image indicating that data is being transferred from a scanner to a printer. Komiyama however, discloses a method of transferring and displaying data in a graphical user interface that displays the transfer of data from a source icon to a destination icon within the computer system (Figure 15, ref. no. 15 and 18; column 8, lines 60- 67), where the destination icon represents a printer (Figure 15, ref. no. 21).

Although Komiyama does not state the transfer of image or data directly from a scanner to a printer, it can be interpreted from Komiyama's disclosure that a source object and destination object can comprise any computer peripheral device that has storage capacity. The utilization of Komiyama's display of data transfer to the scanner input and printer output function made obvious by Sklut et al and Kuwamoto would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art of graphical user interfaces at the time of invention by applicant as having a visual display of the transfer operation would make the information processing system of Sklut et al and Kuwamoto more user-friendly and efficient, allowing the user to easily keep track of the progress of the data transfer. A user who is executing a data transfer function can instantly attempt to correct a problem when he notes a break in the data transfer operation via the visual display.

Re claim 27, the data processing apparatus of Sklut et al includes a means for performing the steps of method claim 7 (column 24, line 59 - column 26, line 21). The limitations of method claim 27 are covered wholly by the limitations of the apparatus claims 7.

Re claim 47, the system of Sklut et al comprises a computer readable memory medium in which the application is stored

(Figure 5 ref. no. 44). The limitations of the apparatus claims 27 wholly covers the limitations of the computer readable memory medium claim 47 wherein the computer memory stores a computer program which executes the steps of method claim 27.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 01 April 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Re claim 1, Applicant argues (Paper #8: page 22, line 9 - page 26, line 13; particularly page 24, line 19 - page 25, line 6 and page 25, lines 16-21) that Sklut et al fails to teach or suggest obtaining peripheral device information including connection and status information, designating a combination of icons displayed on the display, and controlling peripheral devices so designated in order to execute combined functions in response to an execution instruction, and controlling the peripheral devices based on a parameter input.

However, it is not clear how these claimed elements differ from the disclosures of Sklut et al (column 18, lines 25-35; column 19, line 60 - column 20, line 10; column 20, lines 26-53; column 21. line 48 - column 22, line 9; Figures 11 & 13) discussed above.

Re claim 1, Applicant further argues (Paper #8: page 24, lines 19-21) that the device metaphor of Sklut is not created based on device information obtained via the network.

However, the "obtaining means for obtaining peripheral device information" of claim 1 does not require that the device information is obtained via the network.

Re the remaining claims, Applicant argues (Paper #8: page 26, lines 11-13) that claims 21 & 41 are patentable for the same reasons as claim 1, and (Paper #8, page 26, lines 14-18) that the other outstanding claims are allowable because they depend from one of claims 1, 21, or 41.

Applicant's arguments re claim 1, and thereby Applicant's arguments re these claims, have been addressed above.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action

is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Brinich at 703-305-4390. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 7:00-4:30, alternate Fridays off.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 Customer Service center at 703-306-0377.

If attempts to contact the examiner and the Customer Service Center are unsuccessful, supervisor David Moore can be contacted at 703-308-7452.

Faxes pertaining to this application should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 official fax number, which is 703-872-9306.

Stephen M Brinich
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

smb
June 21, 2004

THOMAS D
~~FORMBY~~ LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER